#### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 335 EF 005 203

TITLE Feasibility and Cost Analysis.

INSTITUTION North Carolina State Dept. of Public Education, Raleigh.

PUB DATE 1998-04-09

NOTE 15p.

AVAILABLE FROM NCDPI, School Planning, NC Education Building, 301 N.

Wilmington St., 7th Fl., Raleigh, NC 27601-2825 Tel:

919-715-1990. For full text:

http://www.schoolclearinghouse.org/pubs/default.asp

PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom (055) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS \*Cost Effectiveness; \*Educational Facilities Improvement;

Elementary Secondary Education; \*Public Schools; \*Records

(Forms); \*School Construction; \*State Regulation

IDENTIFIERS \*North Carolina

#### ABSTRACT

North Carolina school districts thinking about building new educational facilities are legislatively required to conduct an analysis that compares the costs and feasibility of building the new building versus renovating an old building. This document contains the cost and feasibility forms suggested for use in this analysis. The forms provide a checklist and rating system to evaluate the feasibility of renovating buildings, and if the feasibility analysis is not conclusive, doing a cost comparison. (GR)



# Feasibility and Cost Analysis

North Carolina Dept. of Public Instruction 301 N. Wilmington St. Raleigh, NC 27601-2825

April 9, 1998

Full text available:

http://www.schoolclearinghouse.org/pubs/default.asp

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION Office of Educational Research and Improvement EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Brumback

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)



#### INTRODUCTION

#### COST AND FEASIBILITY OF RENOVATING OR REPLACING AN OLD SCHOOL BUILDING

GS 521C-521 requires a local school board to submit its long-range plan for meeting school facility needs to the State Board of Education every five years. These plans must consider the cost and feasibility of renovating old school buildings instead of replacing them. No analysis is required at this long-range plan phase. When a school board implements a plan to build a new school that will replace an existing facility, a **FEASIBILITY AND COST ANALYSIS** form must be submitted for each building being replaced. The analysis should be done early, preferably prior to (but not later than) the submittal of preliminary review plans. Send the analysis, along with photographs of the building (copier images are satisfactory, if clear), to:

NCDPI, School Planning Education Building, 7th Floor 301 N. Wilmington St. Raleigh, NC 27601-2825

The Department of Public Instruction is required to submit a copy of the analysis and the photographs to the North Carolina Historical Commission. The Department of Cultural Resources is a good resource for identifying new uses for facilities over fifty years old which no longer meet the educational program needs of the local school system. For their assistance, call Renee Glendhill-Earley, environmental review coordinator, at 919/733-4763.

The Feasibility And Cost Analysis forms are provided as a guide. Other formats may be used, but comparisons must be based on useful life and cost per student. The goals of the forms are:

- 1. Define "renovation" so that comparisons are uniform.
- 2. Make cost comparisons valid by comparing costs per year of useful life for program and support spaces or costs per student served per year of use.
- 3. Provide a system of evaluation that can, in many cases, be done by school system personnel without hiring outside consultants.

The forms establish the following levels of analysis:

- A checklist and rating system (partS II-A and II-B) are provided to evaluate the feasibility of renovating buildings. The system is designed to establish categories that can be used by school system personnel.
- 2. If the feasibility analysis is not conclusive, a cost comparison (part III) is done. Cost analysis may require the services of an architect or engineer.

Complete the general information on page 3 and part II-A "Feasibility Analysis-Building" for each building under consideration. Complete part II-B "Feasibility Analysis-Site" for each site, unless it remains in use for the new facility. (Only parts which are applicable to the project under consideration need be submitted.)

Do not submit forms unless one or more building(s) will be demolished at the site of a new school or replaced with a new school at a new location and no further use of the old facility is identified. These forms are not required for renovation projects.



and the second second

#### COMPARATIVE DESCRIPTION

This criteria is intended to give local school facility planners a uniform criteria for the description of their school buildings. It should simplify the task of individual school evaluation and long-range planning. The descriptions below consider the age, type of construction, apparent condition and design adequacy, life expectancy, feasibility of renovation, and mechanical adequacy. When evaluating a building, consider how it compares to other school buildings across the region or state.

**Excellent** Buildings which are of quality construction, of good design to (long-range)

accommodate a modern educational program, and flexible enough to be adapted

to changing educational programs. Excellent physical condition. Modern mechanical systems with air conditioning typical. Meets all modern code requirements including handicapped use requirements. Analysis will indicate

renovation or alteration feasible, if required.

<u>Very Good</u> Buildings of sound construction, above-average condition, adequate (long-range)

in design for a modern educational program and affords some flexibility to accommodate changing programs. Analysis will indicate renovation feasible. Meets present-day building code requirements, but may have handicapped code

deficiencies. Mechanical systems adequate.

Good Buildings of average construction which meet minimum building code (short-

range) requirements. Design is generally adequate, but may have some features which are inflexible and limiting to educational programs. Average physical condition. May not provide handicapped accessibility. Mechanical systems

average or better. Analysis will indicate renovation is usually feasible.

<u>Fair</u> Buildings of marginal adequacy in construction and condition. Design (short-

range) is typically inadequate for a modern educational program and too inflexible to be adapted. May not meet present-day code requirements and may not provide handicapped accessibility. Mechanical systems may be obsolete and in poor condition. Feasibility and cost analysis will indicate major renovation probably not economically feasible. Typically, should only be maintained for health and safety

until replaced.

**Poor** Buildings which are structurally and educationally inadequate in construction,

design and flexibility. May not meet present-day code requirements for existing facilities, including handicapped accessibility. Mechanical systems may be obsolete or inadequate. Feasibility and cost analysis will indicate renovation or modification is not economically feasible nor recommended. Should be phased

out as soon as possible.



#### **FEASIBILITY AND COST ANALYSIS**

(Rev. 4/9/98)

A comparison of the feasibility and cost of constructing a new school building with that of renovating the old school building(s) that it would replace (in accordance with G.S. 115C-521, amended by H.B.1001, 1993).

Date:	Building Number: (from Property Accounting)			
Administrative Unit: School Name:	Year Constructed:			
	Building Area:(sq.ft.)			
School Address	No. of Stories: (including occupied basement/ground floor)			
School Code:	No. of Regular Classrooms:			
DSP School Number:	Other Program and Support Spaces in Building(list and indicate number of			
Grades Served:	each):			
Approx. Capacity: (when renovated)				
Site will be reused □ sold/transferred □				
"RENOVATION" IS DEFINED AS FULL RENOVAT GENERAL COMPLIANCE WITH CURRENT BUILD BUILDING ENVELOPE (windows, roofing, interior MECHANICAL, AND ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS WILL CURRENT STANDARDS; AND PROGRAM AND FLAPPROXIMATE CURRENT SPACE STANDARDS.	ING AND HANDICAPPED CODÈS: r finishes, exterior walls, etc.); PLUMBING, L BE IMPROVED (or replaced) TO			
I. BUILDING DE	SCRIPTION			
Using a School Planning report or a local evaluation of the building(s) based on the example comparative descriptions on page 2.				
Describe in general the reason for the prop building(s)				
Replacement of major buildings evaluated as very go	and to excellent long-range facilities requires a			

Proceed with Feasibility Analysis and/or Cost Analysis on following pages.

more detailed justification.



#### II. FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

#### II-A. FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS - BUILDING

A.	Educational Program Adequacy - Typical size of classrooms and other functional spaces compared
	to the N.C. Public School Facility Guidelines.

- o 85% to 100% of current guidelines = 6
- o 75% to 85% of current guidelines = 3
- o Less than 75% of guidelines or classrooms less than 600 sq.ft. =0

#### B. Historical or Architectural Significance -

- Listed on the National Historic Register or of significant regional architectural interest
   2
- o Strong local historic interest or sentiment or an example of good school design =1
- o No particular historical value or architectural interest =0

#### C. Safety and Code Compliance

- o Generally meets building code requirements (1978 or 1991 code) =4
- o Needs some modifications in order to meet current bldg, code requirements =2
- Needs substantial modifications to meet current building code requirements = 0

#### D. Relationship to Other Buildings on Site (including proposed additions)

- Single building or buildings connected with enclosed corridors =2
- Well organized campus plan, buildings connected with covered walks, interior corridors = 1
- Multiple buildings, not connected, some exterior corridors = 0

#### E. Handicapped Accessibility

- Generally meets state or ADA handicapped code requirements and is suitable for use by physically handicapped persons = 2
- Needs <u>some</u> modifications to meet handicapped code requirements and to be used satisfactorily by physically handicapped persons = 1
- o Needs <u>substantial</u> modifications to be used satisfactorily by physically handicapped persons (e.g. elevators, lifts, new toilet rooms, etc.) = **0**

# F. Physical Condition of Building - (structural, roof, exterior walls, windows, doors, interior partitions , ceilings , flooring)

- o Very good condition, only minor repairs required =4
- o Moderate repairs required, some replacements (e.g., new windows or roof) -2
- Structural problems or extensive repairs required, replacement of several systems required (new ceilings, roof, windows, exterior wall repair, moving interior partitions, etc) = 0



- G. Mechanical and Electrical Systems (plumbing, heating, air conditioning, electrical service, lighting, telecommunications, fire alarm, computer)
  - Good plumbing, central heating and air conditioning; safe, efficient electrical service and lighting; operable fire alarm and telecommunications =4
  - o Moderate repairs and some replacements required (example: may need new air conditioning or lighting, but plumbing, heating and main electrical service in good condition) = 2
  - o Extensive repairs and/or replacement of several systems required =0

H.	<b>Hazardo</b> us	Materials -	(asbestos,	lead, radon	i, indoor air e	quality)

- o Asbestos and other hazardous materials either not present or stabilized =2
- o Minor problems with hazardous materials, management program in progress =1
- o Asbestos or other hazardous materials present in building requiring removal =0

Total score (A through H) for building

A TOTAL SCORE OF 18 OR MORE INDICATES GOOD FEASIBILITY FOR RENOVATION. A TOTAL SCORE OF 12 OR LESS INDICATES POOR FEASIBILITY FOR RENOVATION. PROCEED WITH SITE ANALYSIS.

#### II-B. FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS - SITE

- A. Site Adequacy Size of site compared to the N. C. Public School Facility Guidelines.
  - o 80% to 100% of current guidelines (or additional land available) =2
  - o 65% to 80% of current guidelines = 1
  - o Less than 65% of current guidelines = 0

#### **B.** Location

- Near the center of the student population served =2
- o Important focus of an older neighborhood, 50% or more students live in the neighborhood = 1
- Not centrally located, most students would be bussed from other areas =0

#### C. Sewer and Water Systems

- o Municipal or county sewer and water system = 2
- o On-site sewer, adequate for number of students, county water or good well with pressure tank = 1
- o Inadequate on-site sewer system or well = 0

#### D. Parking and Traffic Control

- o Paved drives with auto and bus traffic separated, adequate parking =2
- o Some paved drives or minor traffic conflicts, not enough parking =1
- o Bus and autos use same drive or children must cross drives to reach playfields  $\sigma$  some buildings or bus and/or auto drop-off on street, limited parking =0



#### E. Playgrounds and Playfields

- o Ample, well developed playfields, gently sloping, handicapped accessible =2
- Limited playfields, well developed, can be made handicapped accessible =1
- Very small playfields or located across a street from the school or near a busy street or on a steeply sloping site = 0

#### F. Drainage

- o Good site drainage, no problems = 2
- 0 Some minor drainage problems, can be corrected economically =1
- o Drainage problems, standing water on site, would be costly to correct, or in flood plain

#### G. Environmental Problems

- o No environmental problems = 2
- o Minor problems or possibility of minor leaks = 1
- Leaking fuel tank or contaminated well or problems with sewer system discharge or standing water under building or other major problem = 0

Total score (A through G) for site

A TOTAL SCORE OF 10 OR MORE INDICATES GOOD SITE FEASIBILITY. A TOTAL SCORE OF 7 OR LESS INDICATES POOR SITE FEASIBILITY.

IF BUILDING FEASIBILITY SCORE IS 18 OR MORE AND SITE FEASIBILITY SCORE IS 10 OR MORE, NO FURTHER ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED (UNLESS YOU CHOOSE TO DO SO). REPLACEMENT OF THESE BUILDINGS SHOULD NOT NORMALLY BE CONSIDERED.

IF BUILDING FEASIBILITY SCORE IS 12 OR LESS <u>AND/OR</u> SITE FEASIBILITY SCORE IS 7 OR LESS, NO FURTHER ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED (UNLESS YOU CHOOSE TO DO SO). REPLACEMENT OF THESE BUILDINGS <u>SHOULD</u> BE CONSIDERED.

PROCEED WITH COST ANALYSIS FOR BUILDINGS WHERE RENOVATION OR REPLACEMENT IS NOT CLEARLY INDICATED BY THE FEASIBILITY STUDY.



#### **III. COST ANALYSIS**

USE SECTION III-A FOR BUILDING REPLACEMENT; USE SECTION III-B FOR CAMPUS REPLACEMENT; USE SECTION III-C FOR REPLACEMENT OF TWO OR MORE SCHOOLS WITH A SINGLE NEW FACILITY. (Cost analysis may require the assistance of an architect or engineer.)

#### III-A. COST ANALYSIS - BUILDING REPLACEMENT

A.	Renovation of Existing Building -			
	Total cost of renovations - Attach itemized estimate (Use Appendix "A" or equivalent, include minor additions.)		\$	
	Cost per sq.ft. (total cost/gross bldg. area)	\$		_/sq.ft.
	Building Space Efficiency Factor - Area of program and support spaces divided by gross blocorridors, stairs, toilet rooms, mechanical or electrical room underutilized spaces, or spaces not normally a part of the program an auditorium in an elementary school, county or community program area.)	ns, jani n; e.g v offices o	torial, unuse ocational sho	ed or ops or otc. in
	<b>Total cost for RENOVATED BUILDING</b> - per year of use for pro Cost per sq.ft. divided by efficiency factor divided by useful life ( when renovated)	ogram ai	nd support sp	aces-
		\$	/sq.f	t./year
В.	Cost of a New Building -			
	Estimated cost of new building - include cost of demolition of old (Contact School Planning for assistance.)	building	\$	
	Cost per sq.ft. (total cost/gross bldg. area)	\$		_/sq.ft
	Building space efficiency factor (assume 0.75 elem.,0.74 mdl. & high)			_
	<b>Total cost for NEW BUILDING -</b> per year of use for program and support spaces- Cost per sq.ft. divided by efficiency factor divided by useful life (assume 50-year useful life for new buildings)			fe for
		\$	/sq.ft.	/year

COMPARE TOTAL COST PER SQ. FT. PER YEAR TO DETERMINE FEASIBILITY OF RENOVATION vs. REPLACEMENT OF OLD BUILDING. Comparison must <u>clearly indicate</u> the desirability of building the new building to justify replacement (e.g., an advantage of 15% or more).



#### III-B. COST ANALYSIS - CAMPUS REPLACEMENT

A.	Renovations and Additions at an Existing Campus -	
	Total cost of renovations - attach itemized estimate (Use Appendix "A" or equivalent.)	\$ 
	Cost of additions and sitework - attach itemized estimate (Use Appendix "A" or equivalent; include additional land.)	\$ 
	Cost of renovations divided by 25-yr. useful life =	\$ cost/year
	Cost of additions/sitework divided by 50-yr. useful life =	\$ cost/year
	Total	\$ cost/year
	Total cost for RENOVATED CAMPUS Total cost/year divided by	number of students =/student/yr.
B.	New School -	
	Total cost - including site costs, less sale of old school. (Contact School Planning for assistance.)	\$
	Total cost divided by 50-yr. useful life =	\$ cost/year
	<b>Total cost for NEW SCHOOL.</b> Total cost/year divided by the number of students =	
		\$ /student/yr.

COMPARE TOTAL COST PER STUDENT PER YEAR TO DETERMINE FEASIBILITY OF RENOVATION vs. REPLACEMENT OF CAMPUS. Comparison must <u>clearly indicate</u> the desirability of building the new building to justify replacement (e.g., an advantage of 15% or more).



#### **III-C. COST ANALYSIS - CONSOLIDATION**

A. Renovations and Additions at several Existing Campuses -Total cost of renovations -(Include all schools that would be replaced.) Total cost of additions, additional land, and sitework -(Include all schools that would be replaced.) \$\_\_\_\_ cost/year Cost of renovations divided by 25 yrs. of useful life= Cost of additions/sitework divided by 50 yrs. of useful life= \$ cost/year. \$ cost/year **Total** Total cost/year divided by the number of students = \$ /student/yr. **Energy Costs -**Anticipated energy cost per year for Renovated Campuses divided by the number of students. \$\_\_\_\_ /student/yr. Staff Salary Costs (include salary for principal, asst. principals, secretaries, clerical, cafeteria workers, custodians, and librarians; do not include instructional positions) -Anticipated salary cost per year for Renovated Campuses divided by the number of students. /student/yr. **Total cost for RENOVATED CAMPUSES** (cost / student/year of use + energy costs/student/year + /student/yr. staff salary costs) B. New School -Total cost - including site cost and development, less sale of old schools. (Contact School Planning for assistance.) Total cost divided by 50 yrs. of useful life = cost/year Total cost/year divided by the number of students = /student/yr. **Energy Costs -**Anticipated energy cost per year for New School divided by the number of students.



/student/yr.

#### Cost analysis - Consolidation (continued)

Staff Salary Costs -(include salary for principal, asst. principals, secretaries, clerical, cafeteria workers, custodians, and librarians; do not include instructional positions) - Estimated salary cost per year for New School divided by the number of students.

	\$ /student/yr.
Fotal cost for NEW SCHOOL  cost / student/year of use + energy costs/student/year +	
staff salary costs)	\$ /student/yr.

COMPARE TOTAL COST PER STUDENT PER YEAR TO DETERMINE FEASIBILITY OF RENOVATION vs. REPLACEMENT OF TWO OR MORE CAMPUSES. Comparison must <u>clearly indicate</u> the desirability of building the new building to justify replacement (e.g., an advantage of 15% or more).



### APPENDIX "A"

## **ESTIMATE OF PROBABLE COST**

### 1. ESTIMATE OF RENOVATIONS TO EXISTING BUILDING(S)

A. FUNCTIONAL IMPROVEMENTS -Partition & wall relocations to create spaces of at least 85% of current standards (may require gutting of interior) -Improvements to circulation and functional relationships -Construction of special, ancillary and support spaces to accommodate a modern educational program -Other functional improvements (itemize)	
SUBTOTAL FUNCTIONAL IMPROVEMENTS	
B. BUILDING CODE AND LIFE SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS (To improve safety to current standards) -Sprinkler system -H/C Toilet room improvements -H/C access improvements -Elevator -Fire protection improvements for corridors, stairs & exits -Fire alarm system -Exit hardware & door replacements -Elimination of dead-end corridors & other hazards -Other code improvements (itemize)	
SUBTOTAL CODE IMPROVEMENTS	
C. BUILDING "SHELL" IMPROVEMENTS -Roofing -Masonry repairs and tuckpointing -Window replacement -Exterior doors and hardware -Waterproofing -Structural Repairs -Insulation & energy upgrades -Other shell improvements (itemize)  SUBTOTAL SHELL IMPROVEMENTS	
D. INTERIOR AND COSMETIC IMPROVEMENTS -Plaster repair and/or painting -Vinyl tile and carpet -Ceilings -Ceramic tile -Cabinets, Lockers, chalkboards, etcOther cosmetic improvements (itemize)	



E. INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS	
-Plumbing lines and fixtures	
-Heating	
-Air Conditioning	
-Electrical Service and distribution	
-Lighting	
-Telecommunications	
-Computer wiring and technology infrastructure	
-New kitchen equip. (hood, walk-in coolers, etc.)	
-Other infrastructure improvements (itemize)	
SUBTOTAL INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS	
F. SITE IMPROVEMENTS	
-Drainage improvements	
-New paved parking and drives	
-Improve playgrounds and playfields	
-Provide handicapped access to playgrounds	
-Site lighting	
-Revise or replace on-site sewerage system	
-Replace or improve on-site water	
-Connect to county/community sewerage system	
-Connect to county/community water system -Other site improvements (itemize)	
-other site improvements (itemize)	<del></del>
SUBTOTAL SITE IMPROVEMENTS	
G. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS / ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTAL IMPRO	als
-Other hazardous materials/environmental improvements (itemize)	
SUBTOTAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPRO	VEMENTS
Estimated Cost of Renovations (total of A thru G)	\$
Design fees and testing - 8.5% of building cost/site prep.	
Contingency (7.5%)	
Cost of additional land (if applicable)	
Subtotal Cost of Renovations	\$



2. COST ESTIMATE OF ADDITIONS TO EXISTING BUILDING (S) Building Area (sq.ft.) -Area of classrooms and other functional spaces in the addition \_\_\_\_\_ sq.ft. Add 35% for circulation, toilets, mechanical, and electrical space sq.ft. Total bldg. area sq.ft. **Building Cost -**\_\_\_\_sq.ft. building area X \$\_\_\_\_/sq.ft. const. cost = Site preparation for addition (approx. 6% of building cost) subtotal Design fees and testing - 7.5% of building cost/site prep. Contingency (7%) Cost of additional land (if applicable) **Subtotal Cost of Additions TOTAL COST OF RENOVATIONS AND ADDITIONS** 3..

COST ESTIMATE OF NEW BUILDING (S)	
Building Area (sq.ft.) - Attach copy of building program or theoretical space profile (include 35% for circulation, toilets, mechanical, and electrical space)	sq.ft.
Building Cost -	
sq.ft. building area X \$/sq.ft. const. cost =	\$
Site preparation and development (approx. 6% of building cost - elem., 10.4% - middle, 13.2% - high)	
subtotal	
Design fees and testing - 7% of building cost/site prep.	
Contingency (5%)	
Demolition of existing building	
Less sale price of existing site or market value (if applicable)	()
Cost of land (if applicable)	
Total Cost of New Building (s)	\$





#### U.S. Department of Education



Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

## **NOTICE**

## **REPRODUCTION BASIS**



This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.



